

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 10-57 are pending in this application. Claims 1-8, 10-16, and 23-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,388,654 to Platzker et al. (herein "Platzker") in view of U.S. patent 6,707,444 to Hendriks et al. (herein "Hendriks") and U.S. patent 5,826,962 to Rodriguez, Jr. (herein "Rodriguez"). Claims 17-22 and 52-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Platzker in view of Hendriks and Rodriguez and further in view of U.S. patent 5,504,544 to Dreyer et al. (herein "Dreyer"). Claims 38-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Platzker in view of Hendriks and U.S. patent 5,864,638 to Ishizawa et al. (herein "Ishizawa").

Addressing the above-noted rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note each of independent claims 1, 23, 24, and 31 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, those claims now further clarify that the blocking part blocks the light beam emitted from the projection part "when said photography part photographs an image". Such a structure and operation is believed to be fully supported by the original specification for example in Fig. 12, steps S202 and S203. Such an operation in the present invention allows the blocking of a light beam emitted by the projector 4, see for example Figs. 10A and 10B in the present specification, and then after the projector 4 has its light beam blocked, a CCD camera 7 can photograph an image on a writing field 1, to acquire a thus-photographed image. At such a time the light source of the projector is not turned off but is effectively blocked.<sup>1</sup>

With such a claimed structure, a problem recognized by the present inventors can be solved. Particularly, the present inventors recognized that when photographing an image

---

<sup>1</sup> See also the present specification at page 26, lines 3-16.

from a writing surface by a photographing part, the image on the writing surface may not be photographed clearly when the photographing operation is executed when a projecting part projects a projection image onto a writing surface. By blocking the projection image projected by the projecting part at a time of the photographing operation, an image on the writing surface can be more clearly photographed.

The features clarified in each of independent claims 1, 23, 24, and 31 are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied art to Platzker, Hendricks, or Rodriguez. Thus, applicants respectfully submit no combination of such the teachings in those references meets such features.

That is, none of the above-noted references even address a feature of specifically controlling a time when a projecting part has the light output therefrom prevented from being applied to a projection surface. As none of the noted reference teach, suggest, or even address such features, clearly no combination of the teachings in the references would meet such features.

Applicants also note that in the outstanding rejection Rodriguez is now specifically cited to teach the use of a moveable shutter member 62, as shown for example in Figure 5 therein. In that respect, applicants note Rodriguez discloses that shutter member 62 prevents a light beam D from being projected onto an overhead projector member 13. A timing of blocking projected on the light beam D corresponds to a timing of a presentation in which an LCD and an overhead projector are combined, or only the projector is used.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, Rodriguez is not at all directed to any operation even similar to that as in the claims in which a blocking part operates based on a timing of a photographing operation by a photographing part.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Rodriguez at col. 4, lines 8-32.

Applicants also note Rodriguez is not even directed to a similar device as that in the claimed invention. Rodriguez is directed to an overhead projector, which clearly differs from a projection type display device such as in the claimed invention in which a written image can be photographed by a photographing part.

Moreover, no teachings in Dreyer overcome the above-noted deficiencies.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit no combination of teachings of Platzker in view of Hendricks and further in view of Rodriguez, and further in view of Dreyer, meets the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 23, 24, and 31, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom.

With respect to independent claim 38, applicants respectfully submits claim 38 also clearly distinguishes over the applied art. Applicants also respectfully submit the outstanding rejection is not properly considering each of the features recited in independent claim 38, and the claims dependent therefrom.

Applicants initially note independent claim 38 is amended to make a minor clarification to recite the photographing part takes a photograph at least “two times”. Applicants believe that term may be more definite than the previously recited term “several”. Further, the claim language is not believed to narrow claim 38 in any manner.

Independent claim 38 recites:

a shifting part shifting a photography area of said  
photography part on said writing surface is provided;

said photography part takes a photograph *at least two* times in  
a manner such that the photography area thereof is *shifted each  
time by said shifting part*[.] [Emphasis added].

The above-noted features clearly distinguish over the applied art.

With respect to the above-noted features, the outstanding office action cites Ishizawa, and particularly notes in Ishizawa the photographic area 230 is shifted in the frame buffer 202, as shown in Figure 25(d), and as noted at col. 13, lines 35-43.

However, in that respect applicants note the outstanding rejection appears to be misinterpreting the teachings in Ishizawa relative to the claimed features.

Ishizawa merely discloses that a *single image data*, which is input via an image scanner, is processed. In that way, Ishizawa does not teach or suggest an operation of a photography part taking a *photograph at least two times* such that the photographic area thereof is *shifted each time by a shifting part*.

Applicants also note the basis for the outstanding rejection has not even addressed such a feature. As noted above, the outstanding office action cites Ishizawa to disclose shifting of photographic area 230 in a frame buffer 202. Such teachings in Ishizawa clearly reflect in Ishizawa only a single image input via a scanner is processed. Ishizawa does not disclose or suggest any operation of taking multiple photographs and shifting a photography area thereof each time each photograph is taken.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit the teachings in Ishizawa are not directed to the features recited in independent claim 38, and the claims dependent therefrom. Thus, those claims are also believed to distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
GJM/SNS/law